



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,517	09/30/2003	Jeffrey A. Aaron	030306	6101

39072 7590 03/24/2006

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.
P.O. BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

KOC, TARIK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,517	AARON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tarik C. Koc	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: paragraph 0012 should read "a personnel and sensor (PS) database..." instead of "a personnel and sensor database".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 10 objected to because of the following informalities: relating should be relates. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Vinberg (U.S. 2003/0023722 A1), in view of Sands (U.S. 2004/0148526 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Vinberg discloses:

A method of outputting an alert indicating that an event has occurred, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2167

obtaining a status from a sensor (Figure 3A, elements 305-319; paragraph 0030; status information from each element is the equivalent of status from a sensor; see also element 120);

generating the alert (Figure 4, element 410, paragraph 0050);

applying a filter to determine whether to modify a severity of the alert (Figure 4, element 420, paragraph 0053; see also paragraph 0028); and

outputting the alert (Figure 4, element 430, paragraph 0053).

Vinberg does not explicitly disclose wherein the event is unauthorized, and retrieving personnel information from a database, the personnel information relating to the sensor.

In the same field of endeavor (alerts in response to detection of an event) Sands discloses wherein the event is unauthorized (elements 455 and 465, paragraphs 0083 and 0085), and retrieving personnel information from a database, the personnel information relating to the sensor (Figure 4, elements 410 and 435, paragraphs 0069 and 0076).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Sands's teachings of detection of an unauthorized event and retrieving personnel information from a database with Vinberg's teachings of alert generation to obtain the disclosed limitations. Sands suggests in paragraph 0085 that actions need to be taken in the event of conditions relating to the personnel information of the database. Vinberg suggests monitoring and managing

ongoing processes in paragraph 0002, and in paragraph 0050 that any condition known to one of skill in the art may be used in the detection of alert conditions.

4. Regarding claim 2, further comprising retrieving information relating to a prior event from the database, Vinberg teaches in paragraph 0042 the use of an alert condition, database, which a filter module processes events that have been stored prior to processing. In this instance alert conditions objects are the equivalent of prior events.

5. Regarding claim 3, further comprising accumulating the alert, (Vinberg, paragraph 0037).

6. Regarding claim 4, further comprising re-evaluating the severity of the alert, Vinberg teaches in paragraph 0025 the use of an automatic discovery utility that can be used to continually monitor the status of components in a system (the equivalent of sensors). The evaluation of a severity of an event, discussed in paragraph 0026, is continuously evaluated and re-evaluated.

7. Regarding claim 5, further comprising re-evaluating the uncertainty of the alert, Vinberg teaches in paragraph 0025 the use of an automatic discovery utility that can be used to continually monitor the status of components in a system (the equivalent of

sensors). The evaluation of the uncertainty of an event, (called likelihood in Vinberg) is discussed in paragraph 0026, and is continuously evaluated and re-evaluated.

8. Regarding claim 6, further comprising applying a filter to determine whether to limit outputting of the alert (Vinberg, paragraph 0053).

9. Regarding claim 7, further comprising outputting a recommendation relating to the alert, Vinberg teaches the limitation in the disclosure of a warning in paragraph 0050. A warning is a recommendation to an operator to consider the effects of a message sent from a device.

10. Regarding claim 8, wherein obtaining a status from a sensor includes obtaining a status from one of an infrared sensor, a physical sensor, a motion detection sensor, a wireless sensor, an audio pattern recognition device, a video pattern recognition device, a card reader, a biometric sensor, a software monitoring device, a trip wire, an electric eye, a pressure sensor, an access panel switch, a door switch, a microwave sensor, and a System Network Management Protocol (SNMP) trap source/event message, Sands discloses the use of a biometric sensor in paragraph 0023 et seq. The same motivation to combine the teachings of Sands and Vinberg applied in claim 1 applies equally as well to the rejection of claim 8.

11. Regarding claim 9, wherein outputting the alert includes outputting one of a telephone message, an electronic message, a paper message, a visual indication, and an auditory indication, Vinberg discloses in paragraph 0022 a visualization workstation (element 105) that gets notification of events, which are the equivalent of a visual indication.

12. Regarding claim 10, Vinberg discloses:

A system for outputting an alert, the system comprising:

A sensor interface (Figure 3A, elements 305-319; paragraph 0030; status information from each element is the equivalent of status from a sensor; see also element 120);

A database (element 110, paragraph 0023);

An alert processor in communication with the sensor interface and the database (paragraph 0024) element 115), wherein the alert processor is configured to retrieve personnel information from the database, wherein the personnel information relate to a sensor, generate the alert (Figure 4, element 410, paragraph 0050); apply a filter to determine whether to modify the severity of the alert (Figure 4, element 420, paragraph 0053; see also paragraph 0028); and output the alert (Figure 4, element 430, paragraph 0053).

Vinberg does not explicitly disclose retrieving personnel information from a database, the personnel information relating to the sensor.

In the same field of endeavor (alerts in response to detection of an event) Sands discloses retrieving personnel information from a database, the personnel information relating to the sensor (Figure 4, elements 410 and 435, paragraphs 0069 and 0076).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Sands's teachings of detection of an unauthorized event and retrieving personnel information from a database with Vinberg's teachings of alert generation to obtain the disclosed limitations. Sands suggests in paragraph 0085 that actions need to be taken in the event of conditions relating to the personnel information of the database. Vinberg suggests monitoring and managing ongoing processes in paragraph 0002, and in paragraph 0050 that any condition known to one of skill in the art may be used in the detection of alert conditions.

13. Regarding claim 11, wherein the alert processor includes an alert generation module (Vinberg, figure 2, element 220, paragraph 0037).

14. Regarding claim 12, wherein the alert processor includes an input module, Vinberg teaches in Figure 3C messages coming from a plurality of disparate devices (Figure 1B, element 115). It was obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use management application 115 to format objects created from system events into a format readable by other components of the system.

15. Regarding claim 13, wherein the alert processor includes a filter module (Vinberg, figure 2, element 230, paragraph 0042).
16. Regarding claim 14, wherein the alert processor includes an alert uncertainty and severity estimation module (Vinberg, figure 2, element 230, paragraph 0048).
17. Regarding claim 15, wherein the alert processor includes a rule and algorithm update module (Vinberg, figure 2, element 205, paragraph 0027).
18. Regarding claim 16, wherein the alert processor includes a filter/mode selection module (Vinberg, figure 2, element 205, paragraph 0027). Paragraph 0027 of Vinberg details a module that provides access and modification to objects in the system enabling an operator to define criteria under which alert notifications may be reported. the filter criteria maintenance module then meets the limitations of both a rule and algorithm update module and a filter/mode selection module.
19. Regarding claim 17, wherein the alert processor includes an alert output module (Vinberg, figure 2, element 235, paragraph 0043).
20. Claim 10 is essentially the same as claims 1 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and are rejected for the same reason as applied hereinabove.

21. Claims 18, 19, 20 are essentially the same as claims 1, 8, 9 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and are rejected for the same reason as applied hereinabove.

Art Unit: 2167

Contact Information

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tarik C. Koc whose telephone number is 571-272-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tarik C Koc
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

03/20/2006


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER